

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, and 15 have been amended. Claims 6 and 14 have been cancelled. No claims have added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-22 are now presented for examination.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Venkateshwaran et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 14-18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,339,254 of Venkateshwaran et al. (“Venkateshwaran”).

In addition to other elements, claim 1 includes “the monolithic element including a removable portion on the upper surface of the substrate resulting from a runner used to inject the resin in the single molding process”.

Further claim 15 includes “the solid resin element including a removable portion on the first surface of the substrate resulting from injection of the resin through a runner during the molding process”.

Nothing in Venkateshwaran teaches or suggests a removable portion resulting from molding. Venkateshwaran illustrates, for example, a device in Figure 4. The structure does not contain any removable element resulting from the molding process.

The remainder of the rejected claims are dependent claims and, in addition to other differences, are allowable as being dependent on the allowable base claims.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Venkateshwaran et al. in view of Chia et al. and Kaminaga et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 4, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran in view of U.S. Patent 6,081,997 of Chia et al. (“Chia”) and U.S. Patent 6,321,734 of Kaminaga et al. (“Kaminaga”).

Nothing in Kaminaga teaches or suggests the elements of the claims discussed above. No removable portion of an element is discussed or shown in the reference.

Chia also contains differences with the claims. In Figures 1, 2, and 3 of Chia, a fabrication process is illustrated. The illustration includes a “plug” of cured encapsulant 32, which includes a portion that make break off when a substrate is removed. (Chia, col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, line 7) In addition to other differences, the “plug” is not formed on the surface of the substrate, but rather through a hole in the substrate in a different process.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Venkateshwaran et al. in view of Chia et al. and Kaminaga et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran in view of Chia and Kaminaga, and further in view of U.S Patent 5,804,882 of Tsukagoshi, et al (“Tsukagoshi”).

Chia and Kaminaga have been discussed above, and does not teach or suggest the elements of the claims in question. Tsukagoshi also does not teach or suggest the claim elements in question. No removable portion of an element is discussed or shown in the reference.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Venkateshwaran et al. in view Baba et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran in view of Baba.

Baba also does not teach or suggest the claim elements in question. No removable portion of an element is discussed or shown in the reference.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Venkateshwaran et al. in view Baba et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran in view of Baba and further in view of material referred to by the Examiner as “Applicant’s admitted prior art”.

Baba has been discussed above, and does not teach or suggest the elements of the claims in question. The material referred to as “Applicant’s admitted prior art” does not address a removable portion of an element.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Venkateshwaran et al. in view of Chia et al. and Kaminaga et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran in view of Baba.

Baba has been discussed above, and does not teach or suggest the elements of the claims in question.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the Amendment and Remark, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 4/19/04



Mark C. Van Ness
Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980